

EIA-Funded Program Name:

*** Current Fiscal Year EIA Allocation to this EIA-Program:**

*** Name of Person Completing Survey and to whom EOC members may request additional information:**

*** Telephone number:**

*** E-mail:**

History of the program. Please mark the appropriate response (choose one):This program:

Was an original initiative of the Education Improvement Act of 1984

Was created or implemented as part of the Education Accountability Act of 1998

Has been operational for less than five years

Was funded by last fiscal year by general or other funds.

Is a new program implemented for the first time in the current fiscal year

Other

What SC laws, including provisos in the current year's general appropriation act, govern the implementation of this program? Provide complete citations from the SC Code of Laws including Title, Chapter, and Section numbers.

Code of Laws:(MAX. 100 characters)

SECTION 59-18-1310. Consolidation of strategic plans and improvement reports; submission dates.

SECTION 59 18 1510. Assignment of external review committee; activities and recommendations.

SECTION 59 18 1520. Declaration of state of emergency in school rated below average.

Proviso Number:(MAX: 100 characters)

What South Carolina regulations govern the implementation of this program? Provide specific references to the South Carolina Code of Regulations?

Regulations:

R43 261. District and School Planning.

Do guidelines that have been approved by the State Board of Education, the Commission on higher Education or other governing board exist that govern the implementation of this program?

Yes

No

What are the primary objective(s) or goals of this program? Please distinguish between the long-term mission of the program and the current annual objectives of the program. (The goals or objectives should be in terms that can be quantified, evaluated and assessed.) (MAX 3500 characters)

The mission of the External Review Team is to assign to each school and district rated as unsatisfactory an external review team (ERT) to examine the educational programs, actions, and activities of the school and district and to make recommendations for the purpose of improving student performance

The objectives of this program continue to be focused on increasing student academic performance. Schools with a 2003 unsatisfactory rating were monitored to determine if student academic performance met expected progress. This allowed for comparing the initial unsatisfactory absolute value with the absolute value on the report card three years later, during the 2006?07 review cycle. There were 16 schools that did not meet expected progress on the 2006?07 report.

The need for a revised external review team process became apparent during the presentations from representatives of the 16 schools that did not meet expected progress, as required by S.C. Code Ann. § 59-18-1520 (2004) of the EAA. Members of the Review of Academic Achievement Committee, known as RAAC, listened as 8 of these 16 schools presented information that they actually HAD MET satisfactory implementation, even though they HAD NOT MET expected progress. Expected progress measures improvement in academic achievement, whereas satisfactory implementation is determined through implementation of recommendations from compliance with regulations and standards.

As a result of the need for a more efficient process, there has been a joint effort to streamline the external review team process into a more focused, year-long assistance initiative. The External Review Team Process for Collaborative Planning to Increase Student Achievement (ERT Process) for the 2007?08 school year is a simplified effort to provide ongoing support to schools on a routine basis throughout the school year to increase student achievement through the implementation of a few focused academic goals for schools that must meet expected progress in 2008 and in 2009 (schools in ?advisory status?). These goals will be reviewed in October 2007 by an ERT Committee and will become the Focused School Renewal Plan (FSRP), which will be the individualized ERT Instrument for each school that is in ?advisory status.? Schools must continue to have a gain of .3 point every two years or improve the absolute rating at least one level.

In the prior fiscal year, what primary program activities or processes were conducted to facilitate the program's performance in reaching the objective(s) as provided in question 7? What, if any, change in processes or activities are planned for the current fiscal year? (Examples of program processes would be: training provided, recruiting efforts made, technical assistance services, monitoring services, etc. Answers should be specific to the process undertaken at the state level to support the objectives of the program and should be quantifiable Please include any professional development services provided.)(MAX: 5000 characters)

There were 117 schools and 10 districts that had ERT on-site visits during the 2006?07 review cycle.

In the prior fiscal year and using the most recent data available, what were the direct products and services (outputs) delivered by this program? (Examples of program outputs would be: number of teachers attending professional development seminars, number of AP exams given and students taking AP classes, number of students served in the program, etc.)(MAX: 5000 characters)

Each school and district received a report with the ERT findings and recommendations. All ERT reports were approved by the State Board of Education (SBE).

What are the outcomes or results of this program? (Program outcomes can be both quantitative and qualitative and should address the program's objectives. Please use the most recent data available. Examples of outcomes would be: results of surveys, test data, increase in minority participation, reduction in achievement gaps, teacher loans awarded, textbooks purchased, etc.)(MAX: 5000 characters)

Of the 52 schools that were monitored for satisfactory implementation, 51 met satisfactory implementation; one did not. This school appeared before the SBE and must have monthly on-site ERT audits, alternating announced and unannounced visits, from August 2007, through December 2007. An update will be submitted to the SBE in January 2008 as to the progress being made.

Program Evaluations

What was the date of the last external or internal evaluation of this program?

Has an evaluation been conducted?

Yes No

**If an evaluation was conducted, what were the results and primary recommendations of the evaluation?
(MAX: 2000 characters)**

The EOC contracted with Hezel Associates to evaluate the effectiveness of the ERT Program's intervention strategy in implementing school reform plans and in improving student performance in schools rated as Unsatisfactory.

Recommendations:

- ? Consider placing a greater emphasis on the ERT Program's attention to classroom instruction.
- ? Consider allowing the ERT members to conduct unannounced visits and classroom observations.
- ? Consider including in the ERT Review process highly performing schools or underperforming schools that have steadily improved their ratings.
- ? Consider restructuring the ERT Program to emphasize the involvement of the ERT members throughout a school's subsequent implementation of recommendations and deployment of technical assistance.
- ? Consider restructuring the ERT Program to allow for more tailored reviews, rather than a one-size-fits-all approach.
- ? Consider changing the ERT reporting process.
- ? The SCDE should strive to communicate more openly to education stakeholders information about the ERT process, schools involved, and external reviewers, which will increase its credibility.
- ? The SCDE should endeavor to improve its data collection and management.
- ? A rigorous research design should be put into place that would allow researchers to track longitudinal school and student performance.

Can you provide a URL link, electronic version or hard copy of this evaluation to the Education Oversight Committee?

Yes

No

If no, why not?(MAX: 100 characters)

The following questions do NOT apply to programs having a program code beginning with 01. (These are programs administered by or through the Department of Education. The Office of Finance at the Department of Education will provide answers to these questions.) If your program code begins with 01, please hit the NEXT button below. Once you advance to the next page, hit the SUBMIT button.

Please mark the appropriate response:

The total amount of EIA funds requested for this program for the next fiscal year will be:

The same as appropriated in the current fiscal year's appropriation

An increase over the current fiscal year's appropriation

A decrease over the current fiscal year's appropriation

If you indicated an increase or decrease in funding for the next fiscal year, what is the total amount requested for this program for the next fiscal year?

If you indicated an increase or decrease, please describe the reasons for the increase or decrease. How will the increase or decrease impact the objectives of the program as answered in question 7?(MAX: 3500 characters)

Please fill in the attached charts to reflect the budget for this program in the prior fiscal year and the budget for this program in the current fiscal year.

Funding Source	Prior FY Actual	Current FY Estimated
EIA		
General Fund		
Lottery		
Fees		
Other Sources		
Grant		
Contributions, Foundation		
Other (Specify)		
Carry Forward from Prior Yr		
TOTAL		

Expenditures	Prior FY Actual	Current FY Estimated
Personal Service		
Contractual Services		
Supplies and Materials		
Fixed Charges		
Travel		
Equipment		
Employer Contributions		
Allocations to Districts/Schools/Agencies/Entities		
Other: Please explain		
Balance Remaining		
TOTAL		
#FTES		

Data entry complete for this year.

Will additional information (eg. charts, tables, graphs, etc.) be submitted under separate cover to EOC for this program? If so, submit to Melanie Barton at mbarton@eoc.sc.gov. The program number should be cited in the subject of the e-mail.

Yes No